

waters in the Madras Legislative Assembly and the Madras Legislative Council and the Madras Government have decided to request the Central Government to appoint a council to go into this matter. It is a vital matter which affects the interest of Mysore, specially the interests of Kolar District whose future and well-being depends upon the water of Palar and also Pennar. So, I would like to know if the Government have taken precaution and if they have consulted the jurists and what steps they have adopted. In view of the fact that the Madras Government are going ahead and asking for the appointment of an independent council, I am drawing the attention of the Mysore Government to this important aspect, if it has not already been drawn. I would like the Government to take us into their confidence and tell us if not today, some other day, as to what precautions they are going to take in order to safeguard the interests of Mysore.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—I will make a statement tomorrow.

MYSORE WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, the Discussion on the Weights and Measures (Amendment) Bill will continue.

Sri V. M. MASCARENHAS (St. John's Hill).—Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief. After your words of advice, the other day that members must not indulge in unnecessary long speeches and thus waste public money. . . .

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, it is a reflection on us.

Sri V. M. MASCARENHAS.—I did not mean anything like that. The object of the Government in bringing forward a Bill of this kind is indeed commendable and I think they deserve congratulations of this House, nay, of the country. It is a far-reaching measure calculated to do much good to the country and to the community and therefore I feel that an enactment of this kind should not only be simple

and easy in operation from the Government's stand-point, but it should be calculated to see that there is very little hardship caused to the trade. It is my opinion, an opinion shared by my Hon'ble friends like Sri T. Mariappa, Sri Pattabhiraman and Sri Bheemappa Naik, that the manufacture of all these weights and measures must be under the direct control and supervision of the Government as also their distribution. I understand it is a very stupendous task considering that you have got to manufacture thousands of weights and measures of various denominations and most important is their accuracy. But yet the problem has to be faced and as long as the Government sponsors this Bill, it is their responsibility to see that this is done. I would even suggest that the Government constitute a Committee consisting of the representatives of Trade, the Legislature and of the Government to devise ways and means as to how best this could be done. Sir, if this principle of the Government manufacturing all these weights and measures is conceded, the Bill becomes very simple. The Inspectors' functions and responsibilities automatically vanish in most cases with weights and measures issued all over the State under Government control. The Inspectors have to play a very minor part except going periodically, once in a way, to see whether these weights and measures with Government monogram or seal are in use. There is very little work for these Inspectors. The counterfeit weights and measures will be automatically seized and confiscated and if this is done, the work of the Inspector stops there.

There is also another question which has been raised by members, namely, that it would not be sufficient if the primary weights and measures are deposited with the Deputy Commissioner, but they should be deposited in each Taluk Office. But that question does not arise because the provision of confiscation being there, the question of counterfeit weights and measures does not arise at all. If it arises, these counterfeit weights and measures will

(SRI V. M. MASCARENHAS.)

be immediately confiscated and the question of verification, etc., does not arise. I appeal to the Government to take note of these observations and make minor adjustments in the Bill so that it will not only serve our purpose, but will also help them considerably in reducing their burden and task.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the Minister will reply.

*Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—Sir, I have heard with rapt attention to some of the criticisms raised on this Bill. I believe, Sir, if the scheme of the Bill is properly understood, Hon'ble Members will not have any occasion to feel any doubt as to the usefulness of the various provisions that have been made therein. No doubt, it has been said by my friend Sri Srinivasa Iyengar that instead of an Act being amended, there was need to bring forward a new Bill. Of course, it is a useful observation. But I am sure, I shall be able to convince him ere long that under the present circumstances, it was not possible for me to bring a new Bill.

I have made it clear, I believe, when I introduced the Bill, that there are two categories under the Constitution, one is, the specifications or what we call standards that come in the Union list, and the other, the actual working of these standards in a particular State, that comes under the States List. As the Hon'ble House is aware of, after the Central Act was made applicable to the State, Section 2 stands repealed. It is a constitutional provision or a well-known constitutional understanding that it is only the power, that is, the right to legislate, which has the right to repeal. For instance, I cannot repeal a particular provision which comes within the power or the purview of the Central Act and moreover I have made it clear that so far as measures of length were concerned, the Centre has not yet legislated even under the power given to them. Therefore, what happens if the old Act stands repealed is, I will have no power to legislate with regard to that

particular aspect of it that comes under the Union List. There will be a lacuna. The Centre has not legislated so far with regard to one particular item, viz., part 2 that comes within our Bill and further an enactment which has the competency of the Parliament cannot be repealed. Therefore, in essence I agree this is a new Bill in a sense though of course it has been styled as an amending Bill. It can be very well seen that a part of it over which this Government has no power has been regained and the rest of it has been taken away and various new clauses have been put in. Therefore, I believe, I have satisfied the Hon'ble Members if I were to say that it was not within my competence to introduce a new Bill.

I believe, Sir, the Hon'ble Member Sri P. R. Ramiah suggested as to why we should not have a seer of 20 tolas. I have already made the position quite clear by way of replying to queries put to me that if I did it, I would be disturbing the entire equilibrium and there would be violent jerk as it were. What happens is, I will have thousands of seers today in use—not from today, but from the last so many years in various parts of the State; these seers of 24 tolas I must be able to immediately replace. I must be able to draw them back and give new ones. Moreover, in the commercial world and especially in the rural parts, if this suggestion is accepted, it is bound to cause a lot of inconvenience. Hence I have retained certain provisions of the old Act advisedly with a view to see that there are as few changes as possible. In fact, if you look to the tenor of the Act, the only important point that has been stressed in the whole Bill is that villagers should not be allowed to be cheated, if I may use that expression, by unscrupulous persons by the various denominations they are having. For instance, in a maund, as can be seen, there are as many seers as possibly could be made use of. For instance, in some parts, a maund means 40 seers, in some parts it means 42 seers, 45 seers, 46, 48, 49 seers and so on according to the various

† Asterisk indicates that the remarks have not been revised by the Member concerned.

practices or the local customs we have. That is one of the reasons why we want the villagers, either traders or purchasers, to know specifically what we mean by seer, what we mean by sava-seer, a viss, dhadia and a maund. Therefore, there should be no room for any kind of manipulation by any people. In fact, the most important thing in this Bill is Part 1, Part 2, and Part 3 which give the various specifications of what we mean by these names.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA (Basavangudi).—My suggestion to have 20 tolas as seer was to the effect that it might have some relation with the railway seers, that is, 80 tolas making one seer. Thereby there would be some sort of uniformity.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—It is not exactly 80 tolas but 87 tolas. Therefore, it will not have any relation. Twenty tolas a seer will disturb the all-India structure and not have any relation with the railway seer.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—There is also another point, that is, 40 tolas make one pound. In consideration of that the suggestion was made, Sir.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—That is no more in existence.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The next point that was raised was about the use of this 'Dandi' or hand-balance. I quite believe that there is much force in the observation of the Hon'ble Members and that is why I have made adequate provision in the Act to prohibit by rules such kinds of manipulations. I invite their kind attention to sub-clause (2) in section 34 under rule making power, where it is very clearly stated.

“Section 34, sub-clause 2(1):
The Government may make rules for carrying into effect the purposes of this Act.

(2) Without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing provision, such rules may prescribe—

(a) the material, mode of composition, form and specification of recognised weights and measures and of weighing and

measuring instruments and the persons by whom and the number in which they should be made;”

Therefore, it is all comprehensive enough. Of course, with regard to this spring balance and various other methods by which some unscrupulous people may have recourse to have an unfair advantage over either of the parties, there is adequate provision to regulate and control it by means of rules. I think that is sufficient guarantee to see that the fears of the Hon'ble Members are met with. Then, Sir, Sri B. Hutche Gowda mentioned as to why we should not prohibit the use of railway weight. Provision has been made under clause 3 and these weights are also construed as standard weights and recognised weights. Sir, we are interested in seeing that there is elimination of counter-weights and measures and hence adequate provision has been made.

1 P.M.

Then, a very pertinent question was raised by one of the Hon'ble members about the number of penal provisions in the Bill. Sri Srinivasa Iyengar raised a controversy as to whether this Bill was essential, and whether the Act in existence was not sufficient. Sir, I am going to place a few salient points for the consideration of the House to show as to how the present Bill is an important one and of absolute necessity. No doubt, there are six clauses in the Act of 1902: (1) prescribing standards of weights and measures, (2) use of certified weights and measures, (3) rule making power of Government, (4) definitions of false weights and measures, (5) penalty for uncertain weights and the other clauses for penalty for counterfeiting mark of certification. Now, it can be seen that when section 2 of the Principal Act is repealed, some of these powers cannot be effectively made use of unless there is the amending Bill. Under section 5 of the old Act, only the user of uncertain weights and measures was made punishable. If a small shopkeeper allows a dalal or a hamal to work in the shop with such weights and measures, the dalal or

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.)

hamal who works for the benefit of the shopkeeper will be caught hold of and the shopkeeper quietly escapes punishment. Under the new Bill, any owner who uses false weights or measures or who allows false weights or measures to be used is made liable for punishment. This is an improvement which must commend itself to the approval of the House. In the old Act, Sir, mere possession of an uncertain or unstamped weight or measure was not made punishable. Now, even if a person owns an uncertified weight or measure which is not correct or which is not a standard weight, he is made punishable. I believe unless we have such deterrent clauses, it will not be possible to control these things effectively. We have therefore provided various punishments under the penal clauses which do not find a place in the old Act. I believe, this is made as far as possible, foolproof and knaveproof, so that we shall be able to punish a person if he works in an anti-social manner, if he works in a manner so as to cause any wrongful action or loss to the party. It is with this object that elaborate provisions are made in the penal Section. Government thought that these provisions were necessary if we meant serious business and if we meant that effective control must be had in order to minimise this evil. I believe Sri Srinivasa Iyengar is convinced now because he criticised most.

Sub-clause (3) of Clause 3 is absolutely necessary and is intended to enable the Government to enforce the use of uniform weights and measures in accordance with the All-India policy of having only standard weights and measures throughout the country by eliminating local weights gradually as far as we can. Some Hon'ble Members pointed out that 'gunte' has not been defined. Suppose we find in actual working that certain weights or measures other than the ones that have been prescribed have to come in, of course, consistent with the tenor of this Act; under this section we can notify and say that 'gunte' also is a recognised measure. We have said

that so many square yards make one acre. This clause serves the purpose of Government to meet any unforeseen event or contingency.

About clause 4 a point was raised as to why there should be primary standards only in the Districts. That is a very important and relevant point. Primary standard is not a thing that would be put into practice almost everyday. It is the working standard. It is the working standard and working standard alone which has been manufactured, tested, verified and re-verified by the concerned officer, which will have to be authorised according to rules. It is the working standard that is meant for everyday use. Rarely a case may arise where any person may say or challenge that even the working standard is defective. If anybody so challenges, then the primary standard will be made use of. This cannot be kept in every taluk because it must have certain sanctity. I, therefore, advisedly thought that in the district there must be one officer under whose care and custody this primary standard must be deposited. I have said, the Deputy Commissioner must be the custodian of the primary standards in the district and the Chief Executive Officer for the whole State. By this, I feel the ends of justice will be met. In fact, this question was examined by the Scrutinising Committee. It was felt that if these were allowed to be kept in many places, somebody may raise a question that even the primary standards had been tampered with. Therefore, it was thought that it would be better to keep them in as few places as possible so that the common man might have greater amount of confidence in them. So, it was thought of depositing the primary standards with the Deputy Commissioner of the District.

Then, Sir, some Hon'ble Members said that it would be superfluous to make a provision for licensing, and that these weights and measures ought to be manufactured under the supervision of the Government agency. I understand the force of that argument. Today we have our governmental industrial concerns wholly owned, managed and supervised through the

agency of the department. We do not know what the future would be. There are suggestions that even governmental concerns should work as corporations. Even if such a contingency were to arise, whether the industrial concern is wholly owned by Government or otherwise, it is necessary for Government to have this power of licensing. The power of licensing gives double security just as a person having double lock for safety purposes. I have, therefore, advisedly put this clause of licence being issued for purposes of manufacture of these weights and measures. I entirely agree with Hon'ble Members that, so far as the manufacture of these weights and measures is concerned, it must be entirely under the supervision and guidance of the Government; there are no two opinions. I am quite prepared to open a separate section in one of our recognised industries for the manufacture of weights and measures. I have already said that it is not the intention of Government to make any profit out of this. I believe, we must manufacture and sell these things as cheaply as possible so that the common man may not be put to inconvenience.

Then, Sir, about section 15. I believe I have already stated the other day that there is no force in the comments raised by the Hon'ble Member.

These are some of the points I explained as to why this Bill has been brought before this House so that it may receive the approval of this House. There was a suggestion that it may be referred to the Select Committee. . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not now.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I think, Sir, I have met fairly all the criticisms that were raised.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ (ಬಿ.-ನರಸೀಪುರ).—Section 34ರಲ್ಲಿ the power of Government to make rules ಎಂದು ಇದೆಯಲ್ಲಾ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಈ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದು ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಯವರು ಏನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪೂರ್ವಿಷ್ಣು ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಜವಾಬು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—It is a recognised principle. With regard to the statutory rules, they will be placed before this House. As soon as rules are made, I will place them at the earliest before the Legislature.

*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Sir, there are some balances where the weighing arrangement is also found there, for example the Avery Balance, where there is an automatic indicator and weight is indicated therein without any weight being put in. Such balances are sold in the market. The other weights and measures are also sold in the market. I feel that it is very necessary to control by licensing such things also—selling of these weights and measures where the weight is found in the balance itself. Are you including in the granting of licence such sales also? Even though Government may manufacture, they will have to entrust all these commodities for selling to some traders or trading institutions. Only they will have to deal with these under licence. Nobody other than a licence holder should sell these instruments—instruments which are manufactured here and also instruments which are manufactured on the standard basis elsewhere in India or balances like Avery Balance where weighing is being adjusted by an indicator. All these things will have to be sold under licence. I would suggest to Government to include all such balances so as to prevent spurious manufacture and spurious selling.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I believe, Sir, rules will be exhaustive enough to meet the point raised by the Hon'ble Member. If I have understood him clearly, he wants even the selling authorities to be licensed.

Clause (c) of 34 reads :

“the procedure for the verification or re-verification of recognised weights and measures and of weighing and measuring instruments and the person by whom and the intervals within which such verification or re-verification shall be made.”

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.)

Probably in clause (e) also I may have certain powers :

(e) "the number of weighing and measuring instruments to be kept and necessary particulars regarding the same."

This is a matter that I will certainly examine. The simple point for consideration as posed by the Hon'ble Member would be that even selling of these weights and measures must be by a system of licence. I will certainly examine that question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Weights and Measures (Amendment) Bill, 1954, as passed by the Council be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is a motion to refer the Bill to the Select Committee. Sri Srinivasa Iyengar.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I do not propose to move, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then, we shall take the Bill clause by clause. There are no amendments proposed to clauses 2 to 5.

The question is :

"That Clauses 2 to 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 5 were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 6.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I do not propose to move amendments to sections 3 and 4 of the clause. I will move my amendment to section 15 about inclusion which I think Government can accept. I move my amendment to section 15.

"In sub-section (2) for the words 'if he finds such.....in the prescribed manner', the following words shall be substituted :

If he finds such weight or measure or weighing or measuring instrument incorrect, he shall detain it and issue the correct weight or measure or weighing or measuring instrument by collecting the sale value;"

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"In sub-section (2) for the words 'if he finds such.....in the prescribed manner', the following words shall be substituted,

'If he finds such weight or measure or weighing or measuring instrument incorrect, he shall detain it and issue the correct weight or measure or weighing or measuring instrument by collecting the sale value.'"

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I have already made it clear in the reply. If we do not have that clause, the very purposes for which I appoint Inspectors, the executive authorities, would not be carried out. In fact, it is under sub-section 2 of section 15 that any executive officer derives authority for the purpose of verifying and re-verifying. I have examined and that clause is absolutely necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What does the Hon'ble Member say ?

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I seek leave to withdraw, Sir.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I will move my next amendment to the First Schedule.

"In part II after item (b) the following measure of capacity shall be inserted :

'(b) (1) The Mysore Kolaga being a measure of 5 seers.'"

In our parts, palla is in vogue. Each palla has 20 kolagas and each kolaga is limited to five seers. If suppose it is not recognised as a measure of capacity, I think it will be very hard.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—It would be very anomalous, Sir. In our parts one gidna is equal to four seers,

If the present amendment is accepted, 80 seers a palla in our parts has also to be accepted. In some parts a kandaga is equal to 1,600 seers and in some other parts a kandaga is equal to 1,200 seers. These are local usages. Therefore, I would not accept that amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Srinivasa Iyengar, in (b) the Mysore Balla is mentioned Kolaga has been defined in (c). Your amendment ought to have come under (c) as (c) (1).

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—All right, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved.

“In Part II of the first schedule after item (c) the following measure of capacity shall be inserted :

“(c) (1) The Mysore Kolaga being a measure of 5 seers.”

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಈಗ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೀ ಸೇರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಳಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಕೊಳಗ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಳಿಯುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಇದೆ. ಹೆಚ್ಚು ದವಸ ಅಳಿಯುವಾಗ ಕೊಳಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಳಿಯುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕೊಳಗ ಎಂದರೆ ಎಂಟು ಸೇರು, ಒಂಭತ್ತು ಸೇರು ಇರುವುದೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಸ್ವಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಮೆಷರನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲೇ ಅಳಿಯಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಈಗ ನಾವು ಡಿಫೈನ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ, ಕೊಳಗ ಎಂದರೆ ಲೋಕಲ್ ವೇರಿಯೇಷನ್ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಇದೆ. ಕೊಳಗ ಎಂದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ connotation ಒಂದೇ ಇರಬೇಕು, ಕೊಳಗ ಎಂದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲೆ ಆಗಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಲೋಕಲ್ ವೇರಿಯೇಷನ್ avoid ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಉದ್ದೇಶ. ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಾಮಳಿ ಒಂದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬದ್ದಿಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈ ರೀತಿ (b) (1) ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳಗ ಎಂದರೆ ಐದು ಸೇರು ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸರಿಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಪಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ 100 ಸೇರು ಎಂದು ಏನೋ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಮೆಷರ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಬೇಕು ಅಥವಾ ಅಳತೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ಸೇರು ತುಂಬಿ ಅಳಿಯುವ ಹಾಗೆ 100 ಸೇರು ತುಂಬಿ ಅಳಿಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್.—ಕೊಳಗ ಎಂದರೆ ಎಂಟು ಸೇರು ಎಂದು ಮೊದಲು ಹೇಗೆ ಕಂಡು ಹಿಡಿದಿರಿ? ಕೊಳಗ ಎಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಡಿಫೈನ್ ಮಾಡಿಬಿಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಈ ರೀತಿ ಡಿಫೈನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಅನುಮಾನವಿದೆ. ಬಳ್ಳಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಒಂದು ಅಳತೆ, ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸೇರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ, ಅದು ಹೇಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಯಿತು? ಕೊಳಗ ಎಂದರೆ ಎಂಟು ಸೇರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ, ಅದು ಹೇಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಯಿತು? ಇದು ಬರೀ ಹಿಂದೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಊಹೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ,

ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಒಂದೊಂದು ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಲ್ ಆಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಉದ್ದೇಶ. ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಾಮಳಿ ಈಗ ಅನೇಕ ವೇರಿಯೇಷನ್ ಇವೆ, customs ಇವೆ. ಅವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೋಗಿ ಮಗ್ಗಿ ಕೋಷ್ಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಖರವಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಸೇರು ಎಂದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟು, ಬಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ನಿಗದಿಯಾಗಿರುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಾಮಳಿ ನಾನಾ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಇದನ್ನು ತರಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್.—1942 ರಿಂದ 1954ರವರೆಗೂ ಹತೋಟಿ ಇದ್ದಾಗ 100 ಸೇರಿನದು ಒಂದು ಪಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಲ್ ಆಗಿ ಹೋಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಡೀಕಂಟ್ರೋಲ್ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಅದು ಸ್ವಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಅಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಯಿತು?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I do not mean palla is not a standard. When I put this measure of capacity, there is this point that you will have to clearly understand: ಏನು ಇಲ್ಲ ‘measure of capacity’ ಎಂದು ಹಾಕಿದೆಯೋ, ಇದನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದಾಕ್ಷಣಕ್ಕೆ 100 ಸೇರು ಹಿಡಿಸುವಂಥಾ ಒಂದು ಮೆಷರ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಅದರಿಂದ ಅಳತೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಅಳತೆಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಎಲ್ಲಿದೆ?

1-30 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪ ನಾಯಕ್.—Measure of capacity ಏನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು define ಮಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದು ಒಂದು ಸ್ವಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸೇರಿನದು ಒಂದು ಬಳ್ಳಿ, ಎಂಟು ಸೇರಿನದು ಒಂದು ಕೊಳಗ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಡಿಫೈನ್ ಮಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ, throughout the State that will be styled the standard. ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ದೋಜನಮಾಡಿ, ಇದು ಬೇಡಿ, ಅದು ಇರಲಿ, ಅದು ಬೇಡಿ, ಇದೇ ಇರಲಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದಾಗಿ ಈಗ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? ಕೆಲವು ಪದ್ಧತಿಗಳು ಹೇಗೋ ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದ ನಡೆದ ಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಮೊದಲ ಅಡ್ಡ ಒಂದು ಹಣ, ಎರಡು ಹಣ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಹಾಗೆ ಎಂದು ಹೀಗೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಯಾವುದು ಆ ಮಗ್ಗಿ ಕೋಷ್ಟಕದಲ್ಲಿಯೋ ಆ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ಈಗ ಈ ಅಡ್ಡ, ಹಾಗೆ, ಮುಪ್ಪಾಗ ಮೊದಲಾದುವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಚಲಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನೂ ನಾವೀಗ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಡೆಫಿನಿಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಆ ಡೆಫಿನಿಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ 100 ಸೇರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಪಲ್ಲಾ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. That may not come under ‘measure’; that may come under another definition. It can be defined; ‘A palla is equal to 100 measures or what is known as seers.’ ಹೀಗೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದೇನೂ ತಪ್ಪಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. It may be defined as another standard. That is all. ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದೇ ಸರಿ. ಇದನ್ನು ಒಟ್ಟು ಅಷ್ಟು ಆಗಲಿ, ಅಷ್ಟು ದಷ್ಟು, ಇಷ್ಟು ಎತ್ತರ

(ಶ್ರೀ. ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.)
ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾವು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತೋರಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪರಾಧಿಲ್ಲ ಅಳತೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಸುರಿದರೂ ಅದೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಬಿಲ್ಲದಿಲ್ಲ ಸುರಿದರೂ ಅದೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದೇನೂ ಅಂಥ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಈಗ ನಾವು ಕೆಳಗೆ ತರುವುದಾದರೂ ಏನು? ತಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸೇರು ಎಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಐದು ಸೇರೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿ; ಈ ಎಂಟು ಸೇರು ಎಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು 10 ಸೇರು ಎಂದು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿ ದರೆ ಪರಾಧಿ ಲೆಕ್ಕಕ್ಕೆ ಅಳತೆ ಸರಿಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆಯೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—As it is, I believe we will start with a particular measure and I may bring it to the notice of the Hon'ble Members that as our experience advances and if we find any difficulty in the actual working of it we may amend. That is why ample provision has been made under subsection (3) of section 3 under which a notification by Government might introduce any change which they feel necessary and therefore I request the Hon'ble Member not to press his amendment.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಏನೂ ಸಾರ್ಥಕವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ಮಾಡದೆ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That Clause 6 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I am extremely sorry. I wanted to bring it to your notice. There is a clerical mistake in IV (b) at page 13. In the First Schedule under category IV in clause (b) it is said : “The ounce, being a weight equivalent to a dram or 480 standard grains.” Instead of the words ‘equivalent to a dram’ it ought to be ‘equivalent to 8 drams’. It is a printer's mistake.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1. The question is :

“That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Title and the Preamble. The question is :

“That the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I move :

“That the Mysore Weights and Measures (Amendment) Bill, 1954, as passed by the Council, be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore Weights and Measures (Amendment) Bill, 1954, as passed by the Council, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1955.

Motion to consider.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Elementary Education (Amendment) Bill, 1955 be taken into consideration.”

This is a very simple measure. To bring the law in conformity with the present practice this Bill has been introduced. The details of it are elucidated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons and I beg to submit that it may be considered.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Why don't you explain the provisions of the Bill fully?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I have explained it in extenso in the Statement of Objects and Reasons.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—When a Bill is placed before the House for consideration, it is the duty of the Minister concerned to state under what